DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 686 CE 004 478

AUTHOR Olmstead, Joseph A.
TITLE Managing the Context of Work. Professional Paper No. 1-75.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO HumRRO-PP-1-75
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 16p.; This paper is an adaptation of portions of another volume produced by the author

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Leadership Training; *Management; Management Education; *Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Performance Factors; Supervisory Training; *Work Environment

ABSTRACT

People function within situational contexts, and these contexts define and limit behavior. An organization is a very important context and, accordingly, produces potent forces which circumscribe and channel the activities, attitudes, and motivations of personnel. For this reason, both individual and group behavior within an organization is simply not the same as that outside of it. Carried over to management, this suggests that the first thing of which a manager must become aware is that behavior in organizations is usually the result of numerous determinants, many of which will have their source in the work context. To neglect context factors can only cause a manager to misunderstand the problem and take the wrong course for its resolution. Fortunately, the work context is one thing that can be greatly influenced and controlled by managers. The major point of this discussion is that many problems that lead to serious interference with organizational effectiveness have their sources in the failures of organizational leaders to provide work-context conditions that are most conducive to effective performance. Three general factors that control performance in every organization are: effective management, effective leadership, and effective training. (Author/PR)

Professional Paper 1-75
HumRRO-PP-1-75

HumRRO

C 6

Managing the Context of Work

Joseph A. Olmstead

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

uary 1975

Research for

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Social and Rehabilitation Service

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1961 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It is a continuation of The George Washington University Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

The contents of this report do not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the sponsor of the HumRRO research.

Published
February 1975
by
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Prefatory Note

This paper is an adaptation of portions of a volume produced by the author under the sponsorship of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and published by that agency under the title *Working Papers No. 2, Organizational Structure and Climate: Implications for Agencies, National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers, Work, and Organizational Contexts*, February 1973.

Dr. Joseph A. Olmstead is Director of the Columbus Office of HumRRO's Central Division, Suite 210, Commerce Bldg., 1214 First Avenue, Columbus, Georgia 31901.

MANAGING THE CONTEXT OF WORK

Joseph A. Olmstead

In recent years, the importance of the environment within which people work has become increasingly apparent. More and more, one finds in literature concerning organizations such terms as "organizational culture," "company personality," and "psychological climate" to describe the overall context within which people work; and, more and more, research has demonstrated that the work environment exerts a major impact upon the performance, attitudes, and motivations of people who are employed in organizations.

The individual's environment includes his job, which may be either stultifying or stimulating; his fellow workers, whose acceptance he is likely to strongly desire; his immediate supervisor, who may either watch him closely or trust him to get things done on his own; financial administrators, who may think of him either as an independent "economic man" working solely for money, or as a more complex creature with social as well as financial needs; and top managers, who may unknowingly be guided by numerous preconceived notions about what he is like and what he wants. This whole complex of factors impinges on him at every moment, shaping his actions, his attitudes, and the motivations which he may carry with him throughout his career.

The individual is not altogether a victim of this environment; he is able to exert some little control on how it affects him. However, a major finding of those who have been studying the impact of work contexts is that all too often his environment does dominate him by blocking his motivations and driving him into a sort of stubborn, foot-dragging negativism. This result does not always occur by intent or even by default of organizational managers. For example, it has been found that actions taken to simplify management controls or to improve efficiency have often been accompanied by a drop in motivation among employees. Thus, management actions which are not at all intended to affect motivation do, in fact, have a definite motivational impact. Frequently, it is a negative impact.

Of course, many conventional administrative practices may exert a positive impact on the individual's desire to handle his job properly. Sound salary and benefit programs, sensitive and appropriate supervisory methods, two-way communication systems, and procedures for recognition and promotion are all examples of traditional ways of motivating employees which can be quite effective. It is clear that factors in the work environment can have either positive or negative impacts upon performance and attitudes.

Through its effects upon the perceptions and motivations of personnel, the work context especially influences such aspects as job performance of individuals and groups, attitudes toward the organization, interdepartmental relationships, communication practices, decision-making processes, and ability of the organization to function flexibly in response to rapidly changing work requirements.

Components of Work Context

The importance of the work context to both individual and organizational effectiveness can no longer be denied. Although the abilities and personal characteristics of individuals contribute significantly to performance, more and more evidence indicates that the conditions surrounding these individuals frequently make the difference. Accordingly, it is important to understand the components of which the work context is

comprised and the ways in which it both derives from and impacts upon the functioning of an organization.

The overriding concept of organization escapes any precise or all-inclusive definition. To many people, organization means something that is drawn on charts and recorded in manuals which describe jobs or specific responsibilities. Viewed in this way, organization takes on the aspect of a series of orderly cubicles contrived according to some rational logic. Such a view is useful for clarifying duties and responsibilities, but, taken alone, is not sufficient for fully understanding a living, functioning entity which we call "an organization."

For this paper, the term *organization* refers to "the complex network of relationships among a number of people who are engaged in some activity for some reason, where the activity requires a division of work and responsibility in such a manner as to make the members interdependent." The clumsiness of this definition is only partly a matter of syntax. The fact is that only such a general statement can possibly embrace the varied forms of organizations encountered in the real world.

Two aspects of the definition warrant particular emphasis: An organization engages in activities for some reason—that is, it has goals which must be attained; the pursuit of these goals establishes relationships between individuals and subunits which give the organization its bonds of identity and interdependence.

These aspects coincide with Barnard's (1938) important distinction between "effectiveness" (goal achievement) and "efficiency" (internal working relationships). The rational, formal, task-centered aspect is mainly concerned with what is loosely called the "structure" of an organization—that framework of roles resulting from the allocation of authority, responsibility, and duties as usually depicted in an organization chart, and reflecting the formal bonds that tie the organization together. Closely related to structure are certain processes which function through it and make it viable, namely, authority and influence. Since structure is the principal mechanism for channeling the activities of members in the direction required by the organization, it is a critical component of the work context.

The relationship, motivational, maintenance aspect is concerned with the "climate" of an organization—that atmosphere which is peculiar to it and which reflects and determines its internal state and characteristic ways of working. Factors contributing to climate are such things as goals, policies, constraints, cohesion, relationships within and between work groups, leadership, and communication practices.

Taken together, structure and climate constitute the environment within which the work of an organization is accomplished. They play essential roles in channeling activities and mobilizing the efforts of personnel.

Developing Favorable Work Contexts

The preceding definition of organization suggests that the rational, formal, procedural, task-centered aspect of organization must be reconciled with the relationship, motivational, maintenance aspect. Only by giving equal attention to both aspects is it possible to gain control over all of the factors that contribute to effective organizational performance.

Attention to structural aspects is necessary for at least two reasons. First, an effective structure, including concomitant processes of authority and control, is essential for operational efficiency. When circumstances or inclination dictates a disregard for structural considerations, chaos is the usual result. Second, a poorly designed system tends to create frustration and conflict among personnel. Excessive interference with work activities because of breakdowns in the system can be as devastating to motivation as inadequate working conditions or poor personnel policies. This is important because of

its multiplying effects upon attitudes. People get frustrated and angry with one another when they have difficulties in doing their jobs.

The necessity for attention to climate is even more obvious. Climate is the atmosphere within an organization that results from customary ways of working. It pervades every aspect of an organization and exerts some astounding effects upon the motivations, satisfactions, and performance of personnel. Stated very generally, climate is the motivational aspect of organization and, because motivation is critical, the elements that contribute to climate can be disregarded only at severe risk.

In many organizations, the most common attempts to improve effectiveness take the form of modifications of the structural framework—that is, "reorganization"—and of increased emphasis upon the more formalized organizational constraints, such as policies and procedures. Attention to these aspects is important; however, overreliance upon them leads to organizational rigidity. Effectiveness under the complex conditions of today requires flexibility, a quality which has its principal source in the relationships, motivations, commitments, and loyalties of personnel. These aspects are mainly determined by the climate within the organization.

Thus, it is apparent that emphasis upon both structure and climate is required, with maintenance of a reasonable balance between the two. Achieving balance between the two aspects is not easy. However, many executives find ways of reconciling the conflict between them and of developing practices which incorporate both.

Conditions Conducive to Performance. It has sometimes been stated that the proper function of an executive is to orchestrate the application of the skills and energies of his personnel to solutions of problems larger than any of them could handle separately. "Orchestrate" suggests many critical activities; however, above all others, the term implies the necessity to provide conditions that will be conducive to effective performance of organizational members. Some principal conditions necessary for effective performance include:

Factors which enhance proficiency

- Effective structure and job design.
- Efficient procedures and practices.
- Excellent training for both workers and managers.
- Communication practices that supply each individual with information and knowledge necessary for intelligent performance of duties.

Factors which promote a common desire to belong to the organization and identify with it.

- Good administrative, supervisory, and leadership practices at all levels.
- Good working conditions and good equipment.
- Opportunity for each individual to perform as a conscious member of a larger whole.
- Means of providing occasional, explicit acknowledgment of organizational progress to all members and of recognition of the shared responsibility for such progress.
- Opportunities for personnel to influence decisions about matters that affect them.

Factors which enhance motivation

- A system which makes careful provision for incentive, reward, and approval of good work.
- Procedures that make information about individual and work-group progress available to personnel.
- Opportunities for individuals and groups to experience success in the performance of tasks.

- Opportunities for challenge and growth for each individual.
- Opportunities for optimum independence in the performance of work.

Careful scrutiny of these conditions will reveal that they encompass a wide range of elements. These varied elements must be brought together in such a manner that the result contributes to and does not impede organizational effectiveness. The problem of developing effectiveness in an organization is one of making a functioning, operational system out of available human and material resources. Viewed as a system, an organization must be capable of performing more or better than all of the resources of which it is comprised. It must be a genuine whole: greater than the sum of its parts, with its total performance more than the sum of its individual efforts. An organization is not just a mechanical assemblage of resources. To make a functioning entity from a collection of people, buildings, and equipment, it is not enough to put them together in some logical form and then to issue a directive for work to begin. What is needed is a transformation of the resources. This cannot come merely from a directive. It requires large doses of leadership of the highest quality.

Effective Use of Human Resources. The only resources within an organization capable of transformation are human resources. Money and materials are depleted. Equipment is subject to the laws of mechanics; it can be used well or badly but can never perform more efficiently than it was originally designed to do. Humans alone can grow and develop. Therefore, it is essential that this resource be used as fully and as effectively as possible.

Effective utilization requires the organization of duties and functions so that they are the most suitable for the capabilities of personnel in the light of organizational goals, and the mobilization of personnel so as to elicit the most productive and effective performance from them. It requires recognition of the organization's personnel as a resource, that is, as having properties and limitations which require the same amount of maintenance and attention as any other resource. It also requires recognition that the human resource, unlike other resources, consists of people who possess citizenship, legal status, personalities, emotions, and control over how much and how well they perform. Therefore, they require incentives, rewards, satisfactions, stimulation, inspiration, and consideration.

Not to recognize these requirements can lead to serious interference with organizational effectiveness by creating such problems as failures to set performance goals; breakdowns in communication; conflict, strife, and competition between individuals or groups; low morale; and poor discipline. The sources of such problems are likely to be diffuse and quite complex, and may be traced to any or all of an array of factors, including working conditions, superior-subordinate relationships, communication, operational inefficiency, or just about any other condition related to life within an organization.

The major point of this discussion is that many such problems have their sources in the failures of organizational leaders to provide work-context conditions that are most conducive to effective performance. Furthermore, if one examines the above-listed conditions closely, it becomes apparent that all are dependent upon three general factors that control performance in every organization: effective management, effective leadership, and effective training.

Effective Management

Management encompasses all of the efforts required to mobilize the energies of an organization toward attainment of its goals. It involves those planning, decision-making, guiding, controlling, and implementing activities necessary to gather, integrate, and coordinate resources of the organization. Although certain aspects may be found at all

levels, management is most clearly seated at the top, and the discussion in this section will be limited to the activities of individuals who occupy the top positions.

Organizations run a wide gamut of goals, sizes, activities, personnel, and geographical dispersion. The peculiar nature of each organization will determine to some extent the specific problems encountered. Usually, this requires that managers be concerned with particular "cases," and with diagnosing problems and taking actions to improve unique situations.

Carried to the extreme, an insistence on the specificity of problems would render hopeless any attempt to obtain a prior understanding of factors that affect organizational functioning. The saving element is that the problems all occur *in organizations*. Whatever their specific nature, all organizations possess certain common properties that can be manipulated, and, when problems arise, their identification in relation to basic organizational properties makes possible more insightful and lasting solutions.

Every organization has the following:

(1) A structure of some sort, together with a set of either explicit or implied assumptions, premises, principles, or logics concerned with ways the activities of the organization should be arranged and executed.

(2) Relationships among the personnel, some of which are based on work contacts, some on friendship, and some on group affiliation.

(3) Communication processes through which, to one degree or another, there is a flow of information about the internal state of the organization, the environment within which it functions, and the relationship of the organization to its external environments.

(4) Decision-making processes which guide the organization and determine its actions.

(5) Influence processes, usually centered in formally designated leaders, but sometimes based in individuals or groups not anticipated by the organization chart.

(6) Resources to carry on activities, such as personnel, money, and materials.

(7) Motivational and attitudinal characteristics, such as the forces drawn upon in mobilizing the efforts of personnel, and the degree of favorableness and loyalty towards the work, the organization, its component groups, and its members.

Differences between organizations occur because of variations in the form and degree of these properties and in the specific configurations that evolve because of particular goals, tasks, and circumstances. However, every organization possesses the properties in some form and to some degree. Taken together, they constitute a foundation upon which developmental efforts can be based.

This fact leads to a fundamental conclusion. The essence of administering an organization is not so much a matter of solving individual problems as of achieving some measure of integration among the many elements comprising it. Furthermore, management of an organization imposes a major responsibility for creative action. It cannot be just passive reaction to problems as they occur; it goes beyond merely "fighting fires" that arise within the organization. This means taking action to make the desired results come to pass. An executive must take the necessary steps to shape his organization; to plan, initiate, and carry through changes in its structure and climate; and to constantly push back the limitations which human fallibility tends to place upon its capacity to perform more effectively.

Regardless of the type and size of an organization, the chief executive must make sure that goals are established, plans are made, policies are developed, and personnel are recruited, assigned, and trained. He must establish levels of responsibility, set up mechanisms of coordination, delegate authority, direct subordinates, provide stimulation

and inspiration to everyone, exercise control, develop high levels of motivation and morale, and adjust the plans and activities of his organization to broader changes in government, the society, and the community.

If these activities are not performed well, the organization will not function effectively. Any organization is built from the top down. The thinking, ideas, and behavior of the chief executive spread out to include his close subordinates, and are translated into a variety of specific actions and patterns of behavior throughout the organization. If the original ideas or actions of the manager are unsound, the trends in thinking and action that permeate the organization are likely to be wrong. If his basic thinking is sound, this will be reflected throughout the organization.

In particular, some broad decisions—or lack of such decisions—concerning the way the organization will be operated have significant effects upon the behavior patterns that will develop at lower levels. The executive who decides to operate his organization along mechanical principles—through stress upon regulations, standardization, and procedures—will produce communication patterns, administrative attitudes, and supervisory behavior that reflect this attitude. If he places stress upon people and relationships to get the job done, rather than upon the mechanics of operations, this emphasis will be reflected throughout the organization. He will consequently develop in his organization a totally different approach to work, to personnel, and to customers or clients.

Much of this paper has stressed the importance of human factors in organizational effectiveness. Recognition of the importance of human factors leads to the conclusion that top management has a responsibility for doing certain things that will ensure the effectiveness of the organization's human resources. Some of the specific conditions that lead to effectiveness were listed in the preceding section. However, above all of the requirements is one overriding premise: What attracts people most strongly to any organization and maintains their feeling of well-being while working in it is their faith in the common purpose, faith in the leadership, and faith in each other.

Faith in the purposes and leadership of an organization depends upon the integrity of decisions that managers make about goals, operations, and the internal human affairs of the organization. The human affairs aspect requires that managers be chosen with due regard for both their ability and their character, particularly from the standpoint of human values. It also requires that the top management, in its policies and practices concerned with personnel matters, make decisions supportive of personnel, thus confirming in this broad way its concern for the welfare of individuals associated with the organization.

It is an advantage to have personnel who are well motivated and generally satisfied with the organization. It is desirable from the standpoint of the organization that the experiences of personnel on their jobs and in their work environment be good, not bad. It is only realistic to recognize that neither all experiences nor all aspects of a work environment will always be exactly as every employee would prefer them. However, it is important for employees that their lives at work make sense in terms of their own interests and abilities, because people's attitudes and motivations are largely shaped by the meaning they get from their experiences and the experiences of their friends and acquaintances.

This suggests that personnel administration and leadership must be considered integral and important aspects of general management. The successful incorporation of the human factor into management at all levels seems to be something that is desired by employees, many managements, and society at large. It also suggests that managers have a responsibility to wisely handle the human, as well as the operational, aspects of their roles. This realization is becoming more widespread, although there seems to be a continuing confusion in many organizations as to precisely what this means and how to accomplish it.

One far from satisfactory answer must be that there does not appear to be any one formula or set of formulas which will provide ready-made solutions to the problem of developing a constructive work context. A constructive work context is usually the result of careful and calculated developmental efforts by an enlightened management over a considerable period. Someone has said that the essential difference between an effective manager and an ineffective one is that the effective manager thinks of today's actions in terms of tomorrow's objectives, while the ineffective manager takes each event as it comes without concern for tomorrow. Nowhere is this statement more relevant than with regard to development of a constructive work context.

Effective Leadership

Without a doubt, the quality of leadership available at all levels determines the character of the work context of an organization. Leadership is an influence process and the influence exerted by leaders may have either constructive or destructive effects upon the environment of work.

An important step for a top manager is recognition that both job satisfaction and motivation depend primarily and almost entirely upon the leadership in the organization. It is the leaders at all levels who control conditions that make for good or poor motivation and satisfaction. As one example, a key element in a climate of good human affairs is the same degree of integrity in small day-to-day actions concerning any single employee anywhere in the organization as in top-level decisions about large programs that affect many employees.

The fact that leaders at all levels control the work context suggests the necessity for a top manager to develop high-quality subordinates and to insist upon good leadership practices at each and every level from the lowest supervisor up to, and including, the chief executive himself. He must demand the same degree of competence and integrity in lower-level actions as in his own behavior.

Directives and training programs that emphasize good leadership are valuable for communicating the importance placed upon it by a chief executive. However, they alone are not sufficient to produce it throughout an organization. If good leadership practices are to be attained, the reward system in the organization must be geared to this goal. High-quality leadership develops when high-quality leaders are the ones who are rewarded. Building a reward system is a basic step toward establishing a climate conducive to motivation and satisfaction.

Of at least equal importance is what is done by top managers themselves in creating a climate favorable to good leadership practices. There is overwhelming evidence that the kinds of supervisory practices in an organization are likely to follow closely the pattern set by those individuals in higher levels of management. The supervisor tends to offer his personnel the style of leadership he experiences from his own superiors. This applies equally to all levels in organization. Through his own leadership practices and those he emphasizes throughout his organization, the top executive can influence those low-level leaders who exercise the most potent effects upon satisfaction, motivation, and performance.

At any level, sound leadership is not just a matter of hunch or native skill; its fundamentals can be analyzed, organized systematically, and learned by most individuals with normal abilities. Yet, taken alone, no amount of knowledge will improve insight and judgment or increase ability to act wisely under conditions of responsibility.

This raises a series of questions about the abilities needed in order to function effectively as a leader. For example, how aware is an executive of the emotional and motivational conditions of the various groups and individuals—conditions he must take into account in making his decisions? Is he able to gather relevant and accurate

information about the internal conditions of his organization? How competent is he in observing, talking with, and listening to the people with, and through whom, he must work? Is he able to translate his ideas for leading his organization into actions consistent with these ideas? How sensitive is he in determining whether to intervene in activities of the organization? Is he skillful in providing the necessary guidance to subordinates in such a manner that motivation and performance are not damaged? How well can he pick out the essential elements in leadership problems and then supply actions appropriate to the demands of the situation?

Answers to questions such as these have an important bearing upon leader performance. One would hope for a set of rules that would equip an executive or supervisor to cope with the complex leadership problems he faces. Unfortunately no such rules exist because human behavior occurs in specific situations which have endless variety. Each situation is a new situation, requiring imagination, understanding, and skillful actions.

A leader must be concerned with assessing events and finding appropriate courses of action. What is needed is not a set of rules but good skills both in diagnosing situations and in acting appropriately within them. If a leader has a framework of ideas in mind as a working guide, diagnosis will show him where the limits lie. He can then take the appropriate actions.

As one noted writer on administration has put it (Urwick, 1947, p. 42) effectiveness is control over environment. An effective organization is a unified system equipped with the knowledge and skills to control its environment, while an ineffective organization, for the lack of such capabilities, remains subject to forces over which it can exert little control. Similarly, an effective leader is one who understands the organization of which he is a part and the forces by which it is moved, while the ineffective leader is the plaything of arbitrary and capricious powers acting beyond the range of his limited understanding.

Thus, understanding appears to be one vital key. Executives and supervisors become effective leaders by understanding what is required of them, and how, in any organization, human forces such as those discussed in this paper may be combined, balanced, and directed toward the ultimate goals.

Effective Training

The third factor that contributes to the proficiency of an organization is effective training. A variety of terms have been used to describe efforts designed to upgrade the proficiency of personnel. However, for this discussion, the term *training* is preferred in order to emphasize a point to be mentioned here and elaborated later. What appears to be needed at all levels in most organizations are systematically-provided experiences specifically designed to develop hard skills related to actual job requirements—in short, training.

It is important to distinguish between the concept of *training* and the concept of *education.*[1] Both terms are often wrongly applied to the process of human learning with little differentiation. Training is any set of more or less formally organized learning experiences designed to prepare an individual to perform certain acts specifiable in advance. If these acts cannot be specified, for whatever reason, a set of similarly organized learning experiences is called "education." In the case of training, learning can

[1] The author is indebted to William A. McClelland and J. Daniel Lyons of the Human Resources Research Organization staff for this distinction. See *Guidelines for Manpower Training as Developed by the Human Resources Research Office,* HumRRO Professional Paper 43-68, December 1968.

be sharply focused on later job behaviors. In the case of education, the learning experience must be devoted to providing an individual with a background of general knowledge and attitudes relevant to broad requirements that may be imposed following learning.

What is advocated here is training—the development of concrete skills designed specifically to upgrade proficiency in jobs relevant to the mission of the organization. In many organizations, training is not given much attention; in others it is not very effective. In many small organizations, where it is usually needed most, no training is conducted at all.

Most often, the state of training within an organization will be almost solely determined by the amount of emphasis placed upon it by the chief executive. If the top manager values high-quality training, he will usually find ways of getting it accomplished. If training is regarded as merely another item of overhead, to be conducted in spare time as an added duty for some already overburdened functionary, poor results are likely to be obtained.

Unfortunately, all too often, training is viewed as undesirable overhead and is the first activity to be dropped when funds are low. De-emphasis on training as a means of cost reduction is especially short-sighted because it is at precisely the point when funds are short that the productivity of employees needs to be raised. Training is one of the few ways in which this can be readily accomplished.

Efficient and effective training can contribute to organizational effectiveness in at least the following ways:

- Reducing overhead and direct costs by decreasing the time necessary to perform operations effectively and the time required to bring inexperienced employees to full productivity.
- Reducing the general cost of administration by creating a climate which orients employees toward high performance.
- Reducing the costs of personnel administration as reflected in turnover, absenteeism, grievances, and complaints.
- Reducing costs by improving the flow of work.
- Decreasing the costs of administration by reducing need for low supervisor-worker ratios through increasing the proficiency of workers.
- Upgrading the quality of products or services by increasing the proficiency of workers.

To be fully effective, the training program of an organization should be a full-time responsibility for at least one fully-qualified individual and should cover the full spectrum of jobs. Effective training cannot be achieved through part-time efforts or when training positions are viewed either as sinecures for worn-out employees or dead-end jobs for personnel who have failed elsewhere. Training is a complex endeavor which requires a high level of specialized knowledge and sophistication to be effectively managed and conducted.

In many organizations, training specifically designed to develop knowledges and skills concerned with supervision and leadership is especially needed. Many managers are professionally educated, but the courses they take are not noted for their emphasis upon leadership. What is more, all of the accumulated knowledge about human behavior and social processes is not sufficient to equip an individual to be a good supervisor. He needs excellent training specifically designed to develop hard supervisory and leadership skills which have been scientifically confirmed as relevant for effective performance in real-life situations.

The implications for organizational effectiveness are clear. Employees need the skills to perform their jobs proficiently and they also need good leadership. Both of these requirements can be met through effective training. In company with management and

leadership, excellent training is one of the most important contributors to development of a constructive work context and, therefore, to organizational effectiveness.

Conclusion

It has become axiomatic that human factors must receive full recognition in any reasonable consideration of organizational effectiveness. However, in attempts to do something about the human element, the most common approach is to focus upon the characteristics, skills, and deficiencies of individuals. This approach most often leads to emphasis upon selection procedures, performance evaluations and interviews, remedial training, and so forth. These and other such activities which focus upon individual personnel are important and, indeed, essential for upgrading or maintaining the proficiency of an organization.

On the other hand, it is unreasonable to consider people without recognizing the impact of their environment upon them. People function within situational contexts, and these contexts define and limit behavior. An organization is a very important context and, accordingly, produces potent forces which circumscribe and channel the activities, attitudes, and motivations of personnel. For this reason, both individual and group behavior within an organization is simply not the same as that outside of it. This fact can never be safely ignored.

Carried over to management, this suggests that the first thing of which a manager must become aware is that behavior in organizations is usually the resultant of numerous determinants, many of which will have their source in the work context. To neglect context factors can only cause a manager to misunderstand the problem and take the wrong course for its resolution.

The work context is indeed a most potent factor in individual and organizational effectiveness. This is fortunate because the work context is one thing that can be greatly influenced and controlled by managers.

References

Barnard, C.I. *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1938.

McClelland, William A. and Lyons, J. Daniel. *Guidelines for Manpower Training as Developed by the Human Resources Research Office*, HumRRO Professional Paper 43-68, December 1968.

Olmstead, Joseph A. *Working Papers No. 2, Organizational Structure and Climate: Implications for Agencies, National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers, Work, and Organizational Contexts* [HumRRO Final Report, by Joseph A. Olmstead, August 1972], (SRS) 73-05403, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, 187 pp., February 1973.

Urwick, L. *Leadership in the Twentieth Century*, Pitman, London, 1947.

15. *(Cont.)*

Rehabilitation Workers, Work and Organizational Contexts, February 1973.

16. *(Cont.)*

organization; and effective training necessary for the development of skills to upgrade organizational efficiency.